



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Corey E. KLATT ET AL.

Serial No. 09/479,918

Filed: January 10, 2000

For: **SYSTEM AND METHOD OF USING A
SALES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TO
GENERATE PRINTED PRODUCTS**

)
)
) Group Art Unit: 3624
)
) Examiner: E. Colbert
)
) Atty. Dkt. No. 004944.85635
)
)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop AF
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed January 20, 2004 (paper no. 11). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1-32 remain pending.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaksich *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,999) (hereinafter "Yaksich") in view of Sevcik *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,542) (hereinafter "Sevcik"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for producing a printed product in response to a corporate sales management system. The claimed method includes, *inter alia*, in a print processing facility, receiving event data, comparing the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive

determination, automatically generating a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data. The Action concedes that Yaksich fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Office Action, pp. 3-4. Applicants respectfully submit that Sevcik fails to overcome this deficiency of Yaksich. Thus, the combination of Yaksich and Sevcik, even if proper, does not result in claim 1 invention including receiving event data and comparing the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether a printed product should be produced. At best, Sevcik discloses a method and system for automatically generating quotes for commercial printing pursuant to particular needs controlled and specified by the buyer. Col. 1, ll. 10-15. The Office Action cites several passages from Sevcik which describe the selection and processing of variable options in generating an automated quote for the potential buyer. Office Action, p. 4. However, such a method does not suggest comparing event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced as recited in claim 1. In fact, Sevcik discloses that the decision of whether or not a printed product should be produced is ultimately made by the buyer. Col. 13, ll. 27-34. As such, Sevcik specifically teaches away from predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced. Thus, the combination of Yaksich and Sevcik would not have resulted in the claim 1 invention for at least this reason.

With further reference to claim 1, Sevcik does not teach or even suggest "in response to a positive determination, automatically generating a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data." Since Sevcik does not even teach making a determination of whether a printed product should be produced according to predefined event rules, it necessarily follows that Sevcik neither teaches nor suggests automatically generating a print order for the printed product in response to a positive determination as called for in claim 1.

At most, Sevcik discloses executing a job according to quote parameters upon receiving an order command from the buyer. Col. 13, ll. 27-59. Thus, claim 1 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 2-16 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

The system of independent claim 17 includes, *inter alia*, a print processing facility, wherein the print processing facility receives event data, compares the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generates a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data. Similar to claim 1, Yaksich and Sevcik fail to teach or even suggest such a feature either independently or in combination. As such, claim 17 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 18-30 depend from claim 17 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 17 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Independent claim 31 relates to, *inter alia*, a print processing facility, wherein the print processing facility receives event data describing a predefined sales event, compares the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether a printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generates a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data. Yaksich, either independently or in combination with Sevcik, fails to teach or even suggest such a feature. Nowhere does Yaksich teach or suggest comparing event data with predefined event rules that determine whether a printed product should be produced. The passages cited in the action at page 12 disclose methods of handling and distributing business forms and do not suggest any

details regarding a production determination step using predefined event rules. At most, Yaksich discloses a distribution method for deciding which geographic locations will be provided with already existing business forms. Col. 2, ll. 38-67. However, distribution management is wholly different from determining whether a printed product should be *produced* according to one or more predefined event rules. The action also presents contradictory positions in admitting that Yaksich does not teach similarly worded limitations in claims 1 and 17, but alleging that Yaksich shows such a step in claim 31. In any case, both Yaksich and Sevcik fail to teach or suggest a step of comparing event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether a printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generating a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data as recited in claim 31. Sevcik lacks a teaching or suggestion of this feature for the same reasons as stated for claims 1 and 17. Thus, claim 31 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 32 is dependent on claim 31 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 31 and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.


All of the rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the present application and timely notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Dated: July 20, 2004

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD
1001 G Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 824-3000

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509